

## REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-42 are now pending in the present application. Claims 1, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, and 42 are the independent claims.

By the present Amendment, Claim 43 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No other claims are amended. No new matter has been added by the present Amendment.

Claim 43 was objected to under 35 U.S.C. §132 and rejected under U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. While not conceding the propriety of the objection and rejection, and solely to expedite prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claim 43. Thus, the objection and rejection are deemed moot and an indication to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to the Specification for including an embedded link. By the present Amendment, Applicants have amended the Specification in the manner required by the Examiner. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-14, 19-21, 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,409 (Aiken). Claims 7, 9, 15-18, 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Aiken. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the Amendment filed June 5, 2003, Applicants, among other things, amended certain of the claims to variously recite features of a single tuple and/or a single hash value. The Office Action contends that the Specification does not provide adequate support for these amendments. This contention is respectfully traversed as support for the features of a single tuple and/or a single hash value can be found at least at, for example, page 15, line 13 – page 16, line 20 of the Specification. Accordingly, examination of the pending amended claims, as presented in the Amendment filed June 5, 2003, is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the independent claims, independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, determining a document identifier for the filtered document and a single hash value for the filtered document.

Independent claim 29 recites, inter alia, means for determining a document identifier for the filtered document and a single hash value for the filtered document.

Independent claim 30 recites, inter alia, processing in turn each retained token in the

arranged token stream using a hash algorithm to obtain a single hash value for the document.

Independent claim 33 recites, inter alia, means for processing in turn each retained token in the arranged token stream using a hash algorithm to obtain a single hash value for the document.

Independent claim 34 recites, inter alia, determining a single hash value for a document.

Independent claim 37 recites, inter alia, means for determining a single hash value for a document.

Independent claim 38 recites, inter alia, comparing a document to a plurality of documents in a document collection using a hash algorithm to generate a single hash value for the document.

Independent claim 42 recites, inter alia, means for comparing a document to a plurality of documents in a document collection using a hash algorithm to generate a single hash value for the document . . . .

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Aiken does not teach at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, and 42.

Aiken relates to a method and apparatus for detecting and summarizing document similarity within large document sets and teaches computing, for a filtered document, hash values on a sub-string basis. (Aiken, Col. 5, lines 10-35). Specifically, Aiken teaches that a document, or "string," is translated into "a token string that represents and preserves the structure and content of the original or raw data string," where the translation is according to the type of string. (Aiken, Col. 4, lines 38-53). Aiken further teaches that the tokens include position data which describes the location of each token within the document, that the sub-strings of a given length are formed from the translated string, and that a hash function is applied to each sub-string. (Aiken Col. 5, lines 10-43).

In contrast to the present invention, Aiken teaches computing multiple hash values for multiple sub-strings. If the Aiken sub-string length were chosen as the length of the entire document, essential information (i.e., positions of tokens within the document) would be lost. With the loss of such information, the Aiken method of matching documents, as shown in Figs. 4a and 4b and described at Cols. 10 ff., could not be performed because Aiken relies on such position information. Therefore, the sub-string length cannot be chosen to be equal to the entire document length; there must be multiple sub-strings for each document, and thus multiple hash values per document, to perform Aiken's summarizing and detecting method.

For at least this reason, Aiken does not teach the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 29, 30, 33, 34, 38, and 42. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 29, 30, 33, 34, 38, and 42 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this Amendment After Final Rejection clearly places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/3/03

By: Michael E. Kondoudis  
Michael E. Kondoudis  
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501